

An
A N S W E R
To the
L E T T E R
Directed to the Author
OF
JUS POPULI,
By a
Friend of the Authors.



2^{sk}
Printed in the Year 1671

AN

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

you
the
he
and
wh
lea
but
An
ref
rg
ne
ut
air
nah

An

Answer to the letter directed to the Author

of

U S P O P U L I,

By a Friend of the Authors.

IR,



At the first view of your Letter to my friend I begun to apprehend you had transformed your self into an Apostle of Christ, borrowed a mantle of light, and perceiving you so cunning as from a plausible misapplication of the gospel precepts of charity, meekness, patience, & the like graces to study your advantages against a just and zealous indignation occasioned by provocations which might almost excuse the greatest excesses, the least I could expect was a non-contradicting practice; but how quickly am I releived of these apprehensions? And how much more happily have you your self detected that which, though by me evinced by clearest arguments, yet could not have been so much as named without your complaint of reviling and persecution; if your insinuation of a brotherly respect, and fair professions of Christian charity, freedom from wrath, malice, and bitterness, pity, compassion, a deep and

affecting concernment for Gods glory and religious advancement, high pretendings for humilitie, meeknesse, and true holinesse, a tender regard to the union of Christs body, and daylie panting for an escape from the contentions and confusions here below, unto these regions of peace and joy above, even unto the undervaluing of Episcopacy aswell as Presbytery had been followed with an uniforme straine in all other parts, they might have proven very pernicious deceivings; but seeing that, beside the slee and scorneful mixtures which obviously bewray themselves through the whole tenor of your Letter, yow are often transported to the very rudest and foulest eruptions, accusing your opposit as a scurrilous bouffon, bloody incendiary, agent of hell, equal to Beelzebub, guilty of the crime of Cham, and in hazard of Canaans curse; unjust, malicious and cruel in reproaches, nay in the gall of bitterness, and finally whom in the first page youaccoasted as your brother, representing him in the last as guilty of rebellion and treason, worthie to be made an example to all such desperat incendiaries, sure I am that he, who cannot in these variant methods discern your hypocrisy, must yet acknowledge a strength of malice above its subtilty. However Sir in returne to the acceptable deliverance you have given me from meddling further in such naughty stuffe, all the use I make of this observation shall be to let yon see that you are but a man of like passions with us, and that though the insolence of the Surveyer did in effect constraîne my friend to some heat and sharpenesse, yet we do also know in its exigence how to cut off occasion from them which desire it, and to redargue your vaine glorying in the mylder & calmer graces (so to speake) by a more consistent imitation, in which resolution I addresse my self to a short review of your Letter,

And

5
And first taking God to witnesse of these groanes and
teares which our furious distempers doe draw from some of
you, whom we so much persecute, you fall into your
heavy regrates to see the great designes of Godlinesse and
piety suffering so much from some who pretend so highly,
and yet are more concerned for a few inconsiderable opi-
nions and niceties then for charity, meeknesse, unity,
and obedience to Authority, or for carrying on the great
end for which Christ died &c. Sir, though I may
not directly call in question your truth and sincerity
in this appeale, yet seing that all men know how
that you or at least most of that party whereunto you
associat did with hands lifted up to the most high
God engage sincerely, really, and constantly to
own and mantaine these things which you do here
plainely disowne and blaspheme, give me leave to
remember you that though deceivers may deceive
themselves aswell as others, yet God will not be
mocked. If these furious and unchristian distempers,
the object of your groanes and teares, and the perse-
cutions that you mention be indeed nothing else then
the zealous dissent and testimony of such who, in
the feare of the same high and holy Lord God whom
you attest, dare not comply with the present mani-
fest bakslidings, and for which they have been grei-
vously vexed, and if this your Character of their way
as fury be onely either from delusion of interest or de-
licacy of humor, it is much to be feared that he who
is the true and faithful witnesse shall one day witnesse
against you and not for you; one thing I am perswad-
ed of, that whoever at present is a true mourner be-
fore the Lord and as in his sight, doth not more finde
the reigning sins of the Land and the desolations and
profanations of Gods sanctuary to be his principal
motive, then the causes which you assigne to be false

and deceitful. *The great designs of godlinesse do certainly suffer much, And O that God would as manifestly declare the authors of these suffering, as all men know their beginnings. That we are the men you point at by this overconcernment for a few inconsiderable and disputable opinions* is aboudantly obvious, but seing you are not ashamed to terme these things *inconsiderable and disputable*, which yet doe as certainly, both by their institution, and in our experience, conduce to the great ends of holinesse and happinesse, as from Scripture and cleare reason they were evidently determined, and by most righteous and solemne lawes and canons and sacred oathes established amongst us, it were unreasonable for me to redargue your imputation, as for your prejudicial comparing of *Ordinances* with *Duties*, and your endeavours, by magnifying the *ends* of religion, to vilify its midses as meere *nicities*, it is a peice of art so frequently practised by G. B. in his dialogues, and by his antagonist so soberly and convincingly discovered, that I need to adde nothing, onely let me tell you that he who truely values the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus, as he will assuredly dearly esteeme all his purchase for, & gifts unto his Church, so in these bacslidings, oppositions, and overturnings which we have seen, he cannot bnt judge your compliant charity, unseasonable meeknesse, easeful peace, conspiring unity, and excessive obedience to mans authority, to be at best the delusions of a lukewarme indifferent; you say *There is a generation who was once by appearance seriously minding their souls, but now are taken off that noble exercise*; thus you discern the change but cannot discern its causes, nay of these you are so willingly ignorant that while you referre them to *foolish and unlearned questions*, you altogether

disssemble

7
dissemble who were the first movers ; this poor
Church was injoying (although with some infirmity)
our Lords pure ministry and Goverment, and then
These excellent lessons of charity, patience, humility,
meeknesse, and true holinesse, though not in your per-
verse application, were in some request, when, be-
hold, as if we had been delivered from our civil bon-
dage to commit all these abominations, a furious
tempest of perjury, violence, and apostasy broke in
upon us, not onely to the subversion of the Lords
work, but to the laying waste of all religion and con-
science, what mad and untractable *questions*, and
unreasonable and violent *disputings* a faithful remnant
have since been exercised with the Lord knoweth,
this one thing I am assured of that whatever advan-
tage you may take of failings, whereunto you force
them, and however you may vaunt yourself in empty
professions, yet, by their constant stedfastnesse in
midst of so many trials, they have witnessed a measure
of true Charity, patience, humility, meeknesse, and
holinesse that shall be remembred for a testimony for
God and his truth to all generations; passing there-
fore your groundlesse and childish reflexion of our
speaking against Bishops, as if what you oblerve most
we were *best pleased with*, and your more absurd and
ridiculous retortion *as if we had ruined religion, be-*
trayed Christ, and sold him for the gratifying forsooth
of our *humors and passions* (a strange price) when as the
real mony that your Bishops received for him is to
be found in their coffers, the blood of his saints in
their skirts, and under the colour of a name the very
scandal and scorne of all religion in their lives; O-
mitting also that most censorious calumny of our *cen-*
suring, traducing, railing, forging, and publishing of
lies which you cast upon us without the least verifica-

tion, and contrary to the evidence of that profanity, falsehood, and perjury on your part that is sufficient to justify the highest accusation, I wish you could yet consider and lay to heart that it is not by the non-compliance and testifying of our Lords faithful members against corrupt backsliders that the *ligaments of his body are dissolved*, but by the breaking of his bonds assunder, and casting away of his coards from you, that your party have rebelled against the Lord our Head and King, and laboured for the very destruction of *picty and true religion* among us. If with these things you were *rightly and deeply affected* your soul would rather abhorre the wicked, who have marred and removed our true peace, then testify an aversion for such who, at their own cost, dare not joine in your sinfull confederacy, & in place of precipitating an escape *from the contentions and confusions here below* by your airy aspirings *to these regions of peace and joy above* you would preferre for a time that warfare of faith and patience, against the wickednesse, slander, and persecutions of this evil generation whereunto the Lord hath called us. Sir this is the path that these have trode who out of great tribulation are arrived, and do stand before the throne in white with their palmes of victory, singing a new song. Your excessive *charity* towards an ungodly world, and fond and sinful courting of *peace* on any termes wil but in end deceive you, the narrow way of life admits not of your latitude, & heaven knowes not your comprehension.

In the next place you are for *Jeremiah's wilderness*, and upon the wings of the same fancy you flee also to *David's retirement*, why? would you so soone leave these assemblies of treacherous men which you did freely choise? or doth the not ceding of a smal afflicted party to all your imposings seeme to you so terrible a storme
and

9
and tempest? Nay certainly, were there no other argument, the obvious easinesse of the execution with your contrair forbearance is eneuigh to redargue these your wishes either of a wretched peevishnesse, or a worse dissimulation.

You forbid my friend to think that all this is the effect of your Zeal for Episcopacy, And I dare affirme that without your suggestion it had never come into his thought, the giddie instabilitie of the now-Bishop of Dumblaines weak Fantastick braine, dissatisfied with both Prelacy and Presbyterie, whom neither the smal cure of Newbottle nor the more abstract retreat of the colledge of Edenburrrough, nor his owne choice the Bishoprick of Dumblaine could formerly fixe, and the present accession of Glasgow doth as little please, and yet in discourse alwayes longing either for the shades of the grave or the rest above, is not so rare a thing but you may be tainted by the same or the like maladie.

But the cause of your wearinesse is your solicitude for the great Bishop of souls, whom my friend you say is doing what in him lies to depose from his Government and Kingdome, which you adde is neither in meats nor drinks, neither in Episcopacy nor Presbyterie, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the holy Ghost: what a bold accusation have we here? The zeal of Christs government and Kingdome is that which in a manner eats up my friend, he asserts not onely its internal and spiritual power, but also its external and visible administration, consisting in these lawes and ordinances which our Lord by vertue of that All-power given unto him hath expressly appointed, and the whole scope of his writing is in defence of righteousness, and to establish the peace and joy of all its followers, and yet you are confident to say without any reason,

that *he is doe what in him lyet to depose him*. It's true the Kingdome of God is *neither in meats nor drinks*, and thereby all the trash of your unwarranted ceremonies is evidently rejected, but if under this you judge the usurpation of *Episcopacy* & ordinance of *Presbyterie* to be equally comprised, I really feare that in the temptation the same error may substitute to you the *Messe* and the *Lords supper*, or the *Alcoran* and the *Bible* with the same perswasion.

The next thing that occurres is *your opinion of Episcopacie*, and I am assured that as to this whole paragraph you may already finde your self so exactly and fully answered in a little treatise anent the late accommodation, that according to your owne verdict all that read it will account you *deceived* if you let it passe without a reply.

As to what ensues, viz, your resolution to *forebeare both rallerie and injurie*, and yet immediatlie objecting *dull buffonrie*, your meen and il phrased boast of *causing flashes of a left handed witt rebound*, your purpose of seriousnessse which yet you onely terme a *serious mood* and is not indeed more permanent, your promise not to raill, observed just aswell as you have done other promises and vowes far more important, and the prejudice which you endeavour to insinuat from the alledged *general dislike even of good Ministers of our owne perswasion* against my friends book; As to these things I say I shall content my self with the naked observation, onely as to this last I may affirme it upon good ground that, what ever dislike some good mens over-kinde charitie or civilitie towards you, or the temper of their particular dispositions may make them expresse of this book in certaine circumstantial points, yet the substance of the work both for acutenesse and soliditie hath the very consentient

tent approbation of all of our way, and is also acknowledged for such by many of yours, nay further I am perswaded that as none of your champions have as yet ventured upon its refutation, so while reason and right remaine among men it shall alwayes be esteemed a Master peice for just liberty and against tyrannie.

1. But now you begin your onset, and for the first attacque you object against its *rallerie* and *reviling*, the first as *scurrilous*, *foolish*, *light*, *course*, *dull*, *flat*, *a puddel and kennel of putrid matter*, and the latter as *bitter and unexamplified railing against the lawes of nature, civilitie, and Scripture*, *foolish and unpious insulting*, *unjust*, *cruel*, and what not; *intermixing* with both all the little arts of *flyeing*, such as a *seeming tendernesse* to condescend on particulars, *indirect insinuations* rather than *plaine censures*, a *high and serious charge* as before the great God, and then *shutting up* all as if you had said nothing, with a *Lord rebuke thee?* And all this we must belcive to be saide *without railing in sober sadnesse*, and in a *humble submission to the Lords indignation*, but as there can be no reason rendered to perswade this last part, unlesse it be that the words are yours, and delivered by you in one of your *serious modes*, so I am certaine that he who examines these your reflections, together with the other passages that I observed in the entrie by the rules which ye adduce against my friend will finde you by these alone equally reprov'd.

And really since you must acknowledge that an apparent necessitie of a retaliation hath therein transported you far beyond your ordinarie straine, I almost wonder how you could goe thorow with such a long winded invective, haling and houting my friend both before God and men, without the least remembrance
of

of the provocations he had received, but it is abundantly manifest that however you have treated him with much severitie, yet you have used his antagonist the Surveyer with a slighting silence & contempt nothing inferiour; waving therefore these idle and endlesse strivings, all that I returne to these your objections of *rallerie and railing* is first that your offering to dashe his *whole booke* and every page of it with scurrile rallerie is an untruth so manifestly injurious, that I am perswaded, were it not to serve a visible designe of slighting arguments which you cannot answer, all your confidence durst not have averred it: I graunt his animadversions upon the surveyers preface with the postscript of the book are by a just indignation proportioned to their subjects, but as it is only from some little seeming advantages which you thence endeavour to wreste that you have assumed the courage to appeare against my friend in print, so I must conclude that your attempt by such a groundlesse slander to discredit these sound rational and close reasonings wherwith the Author doth in other parts prove his assertions above your facultie of replying, is but a disingenuous artifice.

Next as for your charge of *railing and reviling* it is such an ordinary topick with all such as cannot beare the freedome of truth that it very little amuseth me, onely let me remember you that seing malice and not the matter is the sting of reviling, unlesse you had evinced this to be an ingredient in my friends representations your clamours are but an emptie sound: to call perjurie, violence, irreligion and wickednesse by their owne names and in due season to testifie both against these abominations and their Authors and actors with that burning zeal and cordial resentment that all men owe to the glory of God and honour of his

his holy name is so far from contradicting any gospel precept, that it is an indispensable duetie, and often proves an effectuall meane for the reclaiming even of these who seeme at first to be the objects of its vehemencie; whither my friend was indeed acted by the power and influence of this motive I am not careful to inquire, the thing it self doth so evidently declare it, yet if I might be heard to name *evill things* without the censure of *evil speaking*, and if there be any place for *gentlenesse, meeknesse, and love*, in testifying against such perverse transgressors, I finde it in my heart to say as *in the sight and feare of the great God*, & in a *very serious and humble frame*, with no other designe *then that of Gods glory and my countreys good*, that such hath been the hainous and notorious apostasie of our dayes, carried on by a perjurie so grosse and blacke, and a violence so irrational, and since attended with such an utter abnegation of conscience, insolent scorne of religion, and unexampled increase of all wickednesse, that it may not onely justifie upon the matter all that my friend hath said either against the course or its abettors, but upon impartial reflexion must of necessitie move every serious Christian to horror, & every sober man to astonishment. And therefore,

In the third place, though you goe about to stage him before the world for a *despiser of dominions and a speaker evill of dignities*, yet lest the hearts of evil doers be more obdured, and their hands strengthened by your flatteries, and since I know you will no daigne to read Naphthalies plaine and unanswerable narrative, give me leave but to touch a few particulars of our backslidings and grievances in his vindication.

And

And first I shall onely name that one act amongst many, the act rescissorie, whereby at one blow a parliament, notwithstanding their oaths and engagements to God, and their trust for defence of rights and liberties *from the people*, doe not onely overturne the work of God, but remove the very foundations of all securitie amongst men. 2. Breach of Covenant whereby I am assured we have seen an oath, taken with the most unanimous and heartie consent of the people, and the most profound reverence and observable presence of God, and confirmed by all the authoritie both of Church and State, King and Parliament, violat by the same generation in the height of pride, scorne, and irreligion. 3. The persecutions both of Ministers and people that have insued, what by death, banishment, imprisonment, fining, confining and the like rigours for no other reason at the bottome then because the sufferers could not breake the same Covenant wherein both they & their adversaries stood equally engaged. And 4. The universal profanitic and wickednesse that these strange bakeslidings have either directly introduced or thereto visibly tempted and encouraged.

Sir. I doe not desire you to take these things upon my trust, no, this were not more unreasonable then unnecessary, but if you could lay aside your affected *abstractions*, and pretended *elevations* I doubt not but a very slender examination would render you so convinced of all that I have here affirmed, that in place of judging my friend his *lifting up his voice to shew the people their transgressions*, exciting of both King and people to repent and execut judgement and righteousness, the language of an incendiarie, or his denouncing of woes against a rebellious house and hypocritical generation the office of an agent of hell; you should by
heark.

hearkening, and fearing beare witnesse to his fidelitie.

I have not in the foregoing discourse taken notice of these slanders of *disloyaltie and ingratitude* wherewith you think to make us odious, this is a theme so trite and tossed on both hands, that though in this matter, I might with an hundredfold more evidence demonstrat your flatterie then you can exprobat to us the least misdemaner, yet in real duetic to his Majestie I choise rather to wave it. Neither as to your Bishops and clergie, a companie of men of whom all men except themselves, are now wearied and ashamed, am I more inclined to medle. Onely Sir, if the unpassionat and disinterested composure of my heart, either as to their persons or pettie fortunes, with all the professions wherewith your self do labour to perswade your sincerity may obtaine from you the beleife that you expect of us *viz, that I designe not your infamie but your reformation*, I would say that if to despise the holinesse of God and trample underfoot his truth be *to blaspheme him*, if to acknowledge another supreme and all-determining Governour in the Church then Christ the Lord be *to renounce him*, if to smite his Ministers and scatter his flocks be *to destroy his Church*, if to practise, indulge, or connive at all wickednesse and repute Conscience the onely eye-sore be *to overthrow religion*, if to put to death banish and spoil faithful men be *to persecut the saints*, your Bishops and clergie, notwithstanding of your few insinuat and seeming exceptions, will ever to all discerning inquirers be found even by your owne *Characters* the just object of all mens indignation; how then they will beare *the Lords* or what they may look for in the end I pray God that both you and they may in time consider.

Your

Your next attempt upon my friend concerns the matter of his book, and you say the *whole designe of it is to provoke to rebellion*, a high charge indeed, but as suddenly deserted, for you are not for *raveling into this intangled matter which you conceive to be without both your owne and my friends sphere*, how Sir; are allegiance and rebellion (The common concerns of the meanest, and the great flattering and boasting themes of your preachers discourses) so great mysteries? Or is this onely a declining shift like to that baffle which you designe by saying that *my friends book is but Lex Rex put into another method*, an allegation not more contrary to its manifest tenor then reflecting upon the surveyer whom you would have with so much heat and confidence to have vented things before confuted with very little notice taken of the answers? But the things you cannot explicat Alexander like you can cut off by two positions the first that by immemorial possession and a long tract both of law and practise the King of Scotland is an absolute Sovereigne, accountable onely to God and not to be controuled by the force of his subjects; but more especially that the subjects of Scotland are bound to obey all lawes enacted in Parliament, or at least to submit to the enacted mulcts and punishments, How plentifully hast thou declared the thing as it is? Both first and second, viz. that the Kings of Scotland are Absolut, and that at least in King and Parliament there is such an absolut power as may in no case be controuled or resisted, are indeed the contradictions of the greatest part of my friends book, but are contradictions alone sufficient refutations? or shall your bare assertions be received against the most undeniable evidence. The certaine and cleare constitution of this Kindome consisting of King and Parliament, the expresse establishment by uncontroverted Law, I. 6. P. 7. C. 130.

of the honour and authority of Parliament upon the free votes of the three Estat's thereof, the known restrictions of the Kings soveraigne power who by himself alone can neither make lawes, impose taxes, nor so much as put away one foot of his annexed patrimony; and lastly the frequent approven and authorized resistances and oppositions made against malleverfing Princes, especially that made by the Nobles against King James the third fully approven by the 14. Act 1. P. Ja. 4. extant in the old editions in the blacke letter as they call it, but industriously left out in that of Scheens (the tittle of the act is *The proposition of the debait of the field of Striviling*. The words after the preface are. *That the haill body of the Parliament and ilk an for himselfe declarit and concludit that the slaughter committit and done in the feild of Striviling quhair our soverane Lordis father happinnit to be slain, & ushers divers his Barronis & liegis was allutterly in thair default and colourit dissait done be him and his perverst counsall divers tymes befoir the said field. And that our soverane Lord that now is and the trew Lords and baronis that was with him in the same field war innocent free and quyte of the said slaughters done in the said field and all persuit of the occasion and caus of the samin.* These are the words, and the act is declared to be sealed by the Kings great seal and the seals of part of the three estates) these I say as to your first position are such manifest redargutions, that before equal judges I could undertake, upon the hazard of my life, for the asserting of this one point, to obtaine you convict of high treason as a *leefing-maker* betwixt the King and his subjects, and an *impugner of the authority of the three Estats*: but retracting a little as to this head concerning the Kings power by acknowledging that it *hash been called in question*, you say my friend *hash the*

B

honour

honour to be the first who controverts the authority of King and Parliament as is evidently confirmed by the perpetual practise of Scotland before year 1648. but as it is incontroverted that lawes agreed to by King and Parliament are indeed the ordinarie binding lawes until by the same authority they be repealed ; so seing its uttermost import is that the same soveraigne authoritie, which in absolut Kingdomes is in the Prince alone, is with us divided betwixt, and subjected unto, both King and Parliament, it is evident that this doth no more afford us any *special determination*, then it doth conclude my friend to be *singular* for asserting the lawfulnessse of resisting even the princes who are reput absolute in case of their intollerable oppressions, wherein he hath thousands of concurrents.

But not to trifle with you, my friend alledgeth the Kings limited power, and maketh use of the authoritie of the Parliament in justification of the resistances made by us in the yeers. 1639. And 40. And 43. whereby superaddeing to our natural and common right these civill and positive privileges he accumulath an unanswerable vindication. As for other times wherein, the hypothesis varying, both King and Parliament became our partie, what could be more reasonable then to shew that even the most absolut politick Empire that can be lawfully set up by men is lyable to these implied yea indispensable conditions and exceptions, which in the case of an insupportable perversion doe certainly warrant the peoples necessar resistance, to which if you judge the inquire into the rise of Magistracie, the nature of a compact betwixt a King and his subjects, and the precedents of these two absolut Kingdomes of Iudah and Israel recorded and approven in Scripture to be impertinent, I confesse your reasons are above my reach. I graunt therefore

fore that the subjects of *Scotland* are obliged to acknowledge with all due obedience and submission the soveraigne authoritie of King and Parliament, and that this is the onely supreme authority known amongst us ; but as the consent, contract, and trust by which this authoritie is constitute are by their expresse end and the supposed superior rules of reason most certainly qualified, both as to the point of obedience which is by all acknowledged, and also as to that of submission by none disowned in its constraining exigence ; so I plainly affirme that not onely there was never a surrender made by any people *interminis* disclaiming the lawfulness of resistance in every case, and though the pressures should be the most unjust and violent ; but that a surrender of that nature were in it self utterly unlawful, and no wayes obligatorie, for seing it were unquestionably contrair to the law of God for any people in the certaine imminency of visible destruction to betray themselves and their posteritie in their lives, religion, or liberties by a wilful and explicit acquiescence, it must necessarily follow that either the controverted general surrender, by reason of the tacit exceptions pleaded, hath not the same import, or that in this respect it is equally sinful.

But to this you object that *if such submission be unlawful then they are self murderers who suffer willingly when they are in a capacity to resist*, and this you second with an affected *Alas* for the aspersion that thence would ensue upon the glorious martyrs as *selfmurderers*. Its answered that he who from the meere sense of such a promised submission suffers himself, in a cleare capacity to resist, to be killed, is either a malicious or stupid selfmurderer, I nothing doubt, but seing that to renounce a priviledge, and to forebeare its exercise

cise are things so vastly different, that oftentimes the contradiction of the former is the latters greatest praise, the causes and motives which induced these glorious witnesses into quiet forbearing, and their voluntary and cheerful sufferings are so noble and conspicuous, that I will not so much as call in question their capacity, though for the most part by providence wisely overruled, either to vindicate their immortall fame, or releive my selfe of your pitieful sophistry. But here you think that my friend *will looke to escape by the distinction of religion when it becomes a right settled by Law from what was before it was so established*, But seeing it is evident that he onely makes Law an accession to that liberty which we have by God and natures original graunt, your delusive self-conceit that suggested unto you this apprehension, and your weak opinion that a right righteously and necessarily established by Law can as easily by a contrary Law be renversed are equally contemptible.

In the next place after a preface of your religious preferring of Gods commandments to the Kings Lawes, you fall upon an inference which you say my friend doth thence draw, *viz. because when the Magistrat commands what is contrary to Gods Law we are not bound to obey him, therefore when he punisheth contrary to that same Law we are not bound to suffer*, And for this indeed you treat him as Magisterially as if he were really that schoole boy to whom you do dully resemble him, but sparing to inquire where it is that you do finde him barely delivering this consequence, and not being permitted in this place to explaine how that, regard to the Prince, his place & character, and the general ends thereof, and how that many considerations of prudence, charity, and patience may in lighter occasions perswade to subjection, where its
proper

proper and formal reason hath no immediat force, I shall onely say that the comparing of the limitation of our obedience with the case of our suffering is of excellent use, in as much as it sheweth, first, that as a peoples indefinit surrender though chiefly respecting their obedience doth neverthelesse imply its tacit exceptions, so the seeming generality of the same surrender is no argument to exclude all conditions in the point of subjection, next that seeing a discretive judgement is allowed to the people in the matter of obedience, there can be no reason wherefore in the matter of suffering a thing far more obvious and dignoscible the same should by the men of your way be so much decryed. Thirdly since it is certaine that subjection to suffering was directly commanded by God, and consented to by the people onely for the securing of our obedience, it may well be concluded that as in inferiour unjust sufferings our resistance is mostly restricted not by vertue of our formal obligation to subjection, but by the forementioned influences, so when by notorious and insufferable perversions all these are cut off and both *the place* is plainly foreseited, *prudence* befooled, *charitie* rendred desperat, and *patience* turned into stupiditie, the libertie of resistance must of necessitie be conceded. As for the reason of disparitie by you adduced, *viz.* That in the case of the Kings sinful command Gods countermand of our obedience is supposed to be cleare, whereas our sufferings are not countermanded though he punish unjustly, I shall not reply to you that in the case of a stupid casting away of life or libertie even sufferings aswel as sinful obedience are certainly countermanded, but the thing I would have you to advert to is, that seeing it is not so much the obligation as the right and liberty of defence which

we plead for, and seeing in the case of intollerable sufferings the same is no lesse clearly warranted then sinful suffering appears to be countermanded, the difference by you asserted is but claudicant and insufficient.

But now you are wearie of tracing my friends politics, and truely considering how lamely you have done it, I wonder you have traced them so far, one-ly let me tell you that if you shall be pleased to give me any further provocation upon this subject, I here offer to make good all that my friend hath asserted in maintenance of the Peoples rights and liberties to the most critick, if impartial, of your adherents.

You adde that it is your *chiefe designe* to prove that *matters of Religion are not to be decided by the sword*. Pray Sir, speak plainly, you know and are perswaded that we are neither for the *propagation* of Religion, nor *determining in its matters* by the sword, all that we maintaine is that in the case of unjust suffering for the sake of Religion, however the honour and excellency of the cause may much allay a mans smart, and make him cheerfully to undergo it, even to a not-accepting, & seeming contempt of deliverance; yet he hath the Privilege of common defence no lesse then in other occasions, which if he finde the interest of Religions preservation to concurre it ought so much the more to animat his resolution, now if *this be a spirit totally different from Christ's* who came not to destroy the Law but teacheth us to fulfil all righteousnesse, I leave it to your own second thoughts. *Christ's Kingdom is indeed not of this World*, & that he did most evidently demonstrat by telling that if his Kingdom were of this World then would his servants fight, and therefore seeing that even for his owne rescue he had not called them when he might have had ten Legions of Angels upon

upon his desire, that his Kingdome was not from thence could not be doubted; but to turne this over as if our Lord had said, *Because my Kingdome is not of this World, therefore my servants may not fight*, so much as for their own preservation, is a manifest ranversing of both the text and the truth.

Next you tell us, *That to stirre up to Religions defence by its value is but an ignorant though plausible mistake*; but as your perswading us to abandon the maintenance of Religion by the firmenesse of Gods decree, and our Lords Kingdome, sounds more like the Turkish error of unalterable fate, then to a Christian deference to divine providence, which alwayes admits of our lawful concurse; and as this your doctrine is most palpably contradicted by the constant practice of the whole Christian World, who with might and maine do arme for, and stand to the defence of Religion against the invasion of infidels; so your extenuation as if the hazard of our lives, fortunes, and liberties were not to be regarded, is but an insipide deceitful affectation: if God in the dispensations of his holy and wise providence especially by bringing us under the power of men, subject us to suffering and call for a testimonie, it is most certaine that neither ought Religions concern to discourage nor the considerations of life, fortune, and liberty in the least to demurre us, but thence to inferre, that in case either a Nation or a Person (for as to the point in general there can be no difference) be unjustly and violently invaded for Religion, they ought without further care in a tempting confidence, *that Religion cannot be indangered by the Worlds opposition*, and a base and unrequired abjection of themselves and their interests foolishly throw Religion and all down headlong unto the rage of injurie and tyrannie, is a doctrine

trine too agreeable to the Devils temptation for to deceive any rational man. The truth of the matter therefore is, that as we ought neither to slight nor apprehend too much our own prejudice, so it is from patient and not by stupid sufferings that our *holy profession* receives the advantage.

But to this you subioine your grand discovery viz. that *the great designe of the gospel is to eleuat our mindes to a noble contempt of the world, and a just disregard of our bodies, &c.* whence perswading patience, trust in God, and submission to his will you conclude, let all the world judge whether suffering so like to it or fighting speaking out a froward and impatient minde do best agree with this temper and designe.

Sir, if I may so far digresse under your conduct, I would say in the first place, that the great designe of the Gospel is to reconcile sinners unto God through Jesus Christ who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; your representing it by *elevations of minde and neglectings of the body* doth savour too rankely of that dangerous error of making the righteousness of Christ a meer help to ours; and the Gospel onely the perfection of morality, next I say that setting aside the necessity and beauty of every duty in its season, if it were all your intention to commend suffering above fighting, I would not onely with you in your judicious discerning preferre patient suffering to *passionat and impatient fighting* (things which I suppose were never before compared) but even in humanity, let be in Christianity, advance the palme of a wellcomposed, and resolved patience; above the laurel of a warlike though righteous triumph. But because your rise taken from the designe of the Gospel doth plainly enough insinuat that it is the particular fightings for religion

religion which you go about to decry, it is in this that I desire more distinctly to know your consequence; seeing the same arguments of heavens hope, and this worlds contempt do equally mitigate the passions, and depretiate the worldly prizes of all warres whatsoever, to admit that Religion doth allow all other lawfull warres except what is levied in its owne defence is evidently in an excessse of self denial to make it deny nay destroy it self, but seeing all the pretensions that we have here repeated out of the late dialogues of *the Gospels designe*, *spirituality of Religion*, *the probability by sufferings of advance to the Gospel*, and *carnality of fighting* are already sufficiently discussed by their answerer I shallat present content my self to passe them with a few remarks. As 1. That seeing you are upon the persecuting side (pardon to truth the uneasinesse of the expression) or at least do exhort to patience your antagonists & not your partakers in the same cause, you must permit us to apprehend design aswel as truth in all your reasonings 2. Although if the will of God be so the Gospel excellently instruct to suffering, yet it neither condemneth lawful warres, nor is it imaginable wherefore defensive wars being allowed, a defensive warre upon the mostinjurious provocation viz. persecution for Religion should not be accounted most righteous. 3. That though patient suffering and holding fast of his name under persecution be a strong and convincing evidence of our faith and hope, yet as our Lord by retaining the dispensation in his owne hand hath onely commanded unto us the manner of our suffering, and having expressly permitted flight hath not engaged us to run upon it, so to use the right and capacity which God giveth of self defence without furious passion or revengeful designe can neither be

reprehended nor suspected, I know *a wicked man may fight courageously for Christ*, and so have some blasphemers and Atheists suffered constantly, but seeing we have seen the same persons, with the same strength of grace, both offer themselves resolutely, and suffer in testimony even of their fighting most patiently, you must pardon us to regard the truth more then your cavilling exceptions.

But in the following section you goe about to disprove defensive wars against persecutions for religion by our *Lords precepts and practises*, who you say *blessed those who should suffer for him*. And why not? Surely they are pronounced blessed and they shall be blessed, *But be threatned them that drew the sword*, well, for him you dare not adde, and against him is not doubted, nay suppose it had been against Peter attempting his personal deliverance it had given you no advantage, since he also rebuked him as Satan for desiring him to spare himself; *he blessed likewise the peace makers* entisuling them the children of God, and our hearts desire is that God would raise up to us a true peace-maker, to reduce you unto wisdom; whose wayes are wayes of pleasantnesse and all her paths are peace. *The incendiaries of warre* are indeed no where pronounced happie and the *boutefeus* of rebellion are certainly the children of him who was a murtherer from the begining; but, Sir, is this fair dealing? The question that you move and have to prove is, that my friend is an incendiarie and boutefeu and behold without any reason offered, you not onely conclude him but condemne him, it were undoubtedly as easie and abundantly just for me to inquire *where perjurious persecuters are pronounced happie*, &c, but I will not so much as retort or retaliat with such expressions, *such as breath out warre and crueltie know not what spirits they*

they are of and our prayer to God is that they who breathing out threatenings and slaughter against us terme just defence and necessarie resistance war and crueltie may at length have their eyes opened, *All in the Gospel-dispensation is truly gentle and peaccable; and yet of all things in the world it hath been most reproached for tumult and sedition; but the great consolation of all its followers is, that its author the God of peace will one day make known all false pretenders, and its Lord the Prince of Peace for their persecutions here will in the end blesse with everlasting peace all its true lovers, when according to the excellent order of the Gospels rule of peace the Kingdome of God shall be fully revealed in righteousness first, and then in peace and joy in the holy ghost.*

But you say that *all this viz* a non-resistance of, and submission to persecution *was signally confirmed by our masters unexampld sufferings*, and yet you know so well that the free and voluntarie sufferings of our Lord are in themselves no lesse unexampld then unimitable, and that it is the manner and not the matter thereof that we are to follow, that I cannot but doubt your sinceritie, Christ not onely refused the aide of the sword but came into the world *willinglie*, went up to Ierusalem *stedfastly*, exposed himself *knowingly*, and lastly would not aske the assistance of legions of *Angels* readie at his desire that the Scriptures signifying how *that he ought* to have suffered might be fulfilled; and is it possible that you can think, that these specifick acts are for our imitation? But you say that *he entailed perdition on these that should draw the sword to wit all these that are not warranted to doe it by the Magistrat.* How long will you love vanitie and seek after leessing? Our Lord in that place doth most plainly, for the averting of *Peter's* unseasonable zeal, and the

comforting of all his Disciples, denounce that *all these who take the sword unjustly shall perish by the sword, and. Rev. 13. 10.* we have the parallel place more fully set downe *he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword* (spoken of persecuting Magistrates aswel as others) *Here is the patience and the faith of the Saints,* And yet you have the confidence to smooth it over as if this sad doome had been pronounced not onely against Peter but all such as shall be by the force of oppression constrained to their owne defence.

You adde that *he witnessed that good confession before Pilat that Caesar needed apprehend no hazard from his Kingdome, since it not being of this world was not to be fought for.* And doe you indeed think that this is the emphasis of that *good confession viz to satisfie Cesars unjust fears?* O perverse flatterie! The excellent goodnesse of our Lords confession cannot but be sweetly relished by every serious Christian to lye in these words *thou saiest that I am a King to this end was I borne and for this cause came I unto the world that I should beare witness unto the truth,* how then are you not ashamed not onely to wrest it unto the pitieful interest of Princes; but to misconstrue the whole passage as if our Lord in purging himself by a voluntarie and free forbearance of the affectation of a worldly Kingdome did in effect disowne all defensive armes to the encouraging and strengthening of the most bloudie tyrans.

You think it strange that through the whole Gospel we should meet with repeated blessings on these that suffer, but never one upon such as fight; but if our Lord having declared that he came not to destroy the Law of righteousness did accommodat his encouragements to his Apostles, unto the dispensation of his providence under which for the greater glorie of the power

power of his free grace he thought good to gather and traine up his Church, should you or any else be there-
 at stumbled; for my part when I reflect upon both the sufferings and grace of these primitive times and how the Lord did order them, I rather wonder at that admonition by you observed that they should sell their coats to buy swords; but you say *had the Disciples understood this of the material sword either their practises or writings should have had some vestiges of that sense*, by the which very argument a man may as easily deny that the *Purse* there spoken of is to be taken for a material one; but seeing the tenor of the context and relation made by the Lord to their former mission doe exhibit the meaning with that evidence as cannot be convelled, for want of an unoccasional confirmation, I go on to examine the rest of your glosse upon the place; and taking notice *that the Disciples at the time by presenting two swords did shew that they understood the Lord to speake of a material sword* you say *that by his answer it is enough, which cannot relate to the two swords produced no wise enough for eleven persons, he corrects their error & breaks off their purpose as if he had said, enough of this, or no more of it, since he sawe they misunderstood his former words of a sword.* Thus rather then to assent to truth you would have our Lord by such a stop tacitly to acknowledge his own inadvertency, but the passage is too obvious to be thus abused, in asmuch as our Lord having before both signified and prepared for his owne imminent departure, forewarnes them by the necessitie, *of a purse and a sword* of the straits and dangers that would ensue, whereupon they, its like, out of their blind and forward desire to have him delivered from the hand of the jewes lay hold on his words and shew him two swords, probably with a confident remembrance of his former miracles, and
 this

this their precipitancy our Lord according to the meek and sweet composure of his patience now entering upon his sufferings. thinks fit to reſtraine with this ſhort correction *itis enough*, i. e. *it is enough at this ſeaſon*, there muſt be no reſiſtance in my voluntary ſuffering: whether then yours or this explication be the more genuine I referre it to the diſcerning of all underſtanding men.

But yet *from all this* you ſay *it will eaſily appeare to one who examines the matter without prejudice whether ſuffering or fighting have the cleareſt characters of Chriſts meekneſſe*. Sir though the nature of warre being conſidered, the comparison of ſuffering and fighting in the point of meekneſſe ſeems almoſt to be inept, yet if you will be pleaſed to advert how that our Lord alſo well in his victorious triumph as in his loweſt ſufferings is repreſented in the Revel: under the ſame figure of the *Lambe*, its like you may come to underſtand that that calme ſtaiedneſſe of minde, which by all is reput the trueſt marke of the nobleſt courage, may in a Chriſtian champion be yet further advanced and beautified with his Maſters meekneſſe.

Your laſt argument againſt deſenſive armes upon the account of religion is *that the doctrine of ſuffering tends moſt to the recommending of the Chriſtian religion to all Princes and Stats, whereas the doctrine of defence may prepoſſeſſe their mindes with the deepeſt prejudices, &c.* Thus to carry your cauſe you care not what you ſay, this argument can have no proceſſe unleſſe we ſuppoſe in all Princes and States a moſt irrational averſion for religion, viz, ſuch as cannot endure that it ſhould pretend to any manner of right or comport with its profeſſors at a lower rate then the abſolute ſubjection of their lives and liberties; upon this account, and yet without the leaſt check of correction, you

you bestow upon it a whole long paragraph. But seeing that all we plead amounts to no more then that religion the great instructor of righteousness may not deprive us of all right, and that its high honour may not deprime men below the condition of slavery, you must pardon me to think your insinuation more odious then obliging.

But for to mend your error you adde *that indeed the Alcoran incites to kill all who are not Musulmans but our holy profession rejects carnal weapons from its defence.* Who heard ever such distraction? Can we not detest the Mahumetan Barbaritie of forcing religion by the sword, unlessse we lay open all Christendome to their rage and cruelty? Or is your minde so blinded by your designe that you could not perceive the fair and rational midse of the lawfulnessse of selfe defence against intollerable oppression, and that aswell yea rather when inflicted for, and levelled to destroy religion, then in the case of any other unjust pretense, without either impinging upon the turkish violent propagations on the one hand, or betraying the cause of religion by a base stupiditie upon the other? Religion certainly in it self is no occasion of warres, but if your Musulemans make it so, must we therefore abandon both it and our selves to their pleasure? And if unjust warres doe arise from your lusts may not a just opposition very well consist, nay be warranted by *that which injoyes the mortifying of them all?* Sir your lapses here are so grosse and rawe against all right and reason that I am ashamed to draw forth against you positive conclusions.

To these things you subjoyne the praise of Religion, *For the allegiance towards Princes and peaceablenessse towards fellow subjects which it teacheth, thence commending both its innocency & the great securitie it giveth*

veth unto all societies, but say you, the doctrine of resistance will change its whole visage so that this day - starre whose aspects are benigne will look like a fierie-comet blazing warres, &c. Sir, this charge appeares to be so weightie that I willingly wave its extravagance, that I may meet with its reason, For (you continue) if this principle be drunke in by Christian societies they may for ever despair of peace, since all cannot be of one minde in matters of Religion, and the side or partie oppressed would undoubtedly raise sturs. But seeing the principle you inveigh against is in effect none other then that right of self - preservation most deeply engraven in natures tables, to which we plead, that Religion according to its dignitie, in the case of persecution, intending the injurie, may make no exception, is it not evident that your arguing against this Privilege as a novel seditious conceit is in effect nothing else save a colourable pretext, thorow which Religion is onely struck at as in its nature altogether *unpeaceable and the very seed of endlesse contentions*? But the matter is plaine, the right self - defence is the principal reason both of the institution and continuance of Government, Religion in it self is one, simple, most pure, and peaceable; all contended for, is, that such as by embracing of it do become partakers of the highest blessing may not therefore forfeit the most common rights, if this be to turne *this heavenly and benigne star of Religion unto a fiery blazing comet*, and not rather by maligning it, with all the perversities of its adversaries, unlesse it be made obnoxious to all their injuries, either to render it odious to Princes, or lyable to all the arbitrarie imposings and persecutions of tyrannie, let all men judge; it is true that by reason of mans corruption *a harmony in Religion is scarce to be attained*, but because error and irreligion will always be stirring,

perle -

persecuting, and provoking to stirrs and tumults, must therefore the truth and its professors be stupidely submitted to their lust and rage? You say, *That even we ourselves would finde it a hard pull to governe at this rate, specially if we keep up our quarrels both at tolleration and moderation.* How? Would we finde it so hard a task by keeping faith to retaine both obedience and peace, and by pleasing God to please all men? That this was the true Crisis of our affairs in the late revolution I believe thousands do now see, who then would not, as for your objecting of our quarrels at tolleration and moderation, is not this a strange envie, that because we cannot stretch to a compliance with all the present evil courses, therefore even our just hatred at error and heresie specially seeing it was so very disloyal and seditious must also be reckoned to our disadvantage.

After this you tell us *that from this principle there were no peace to be expected from Papists.* And to deale fairly and shortly with you I freely accord that if the Papists did hold the truth, and were therefore intolerably persecut, they might very lawfully resist in their owne necessarie defence; but since they both practise grosse idolatrie and other abominations, and are also restlesse in their wicked machinations, it is evident that they could as little reclaime against deserved punishment under the notion of persecution, as at present they are largely indulged.

For a conclusion then you tell us *that the doctrine of patient peaceable suffering excludes all hazards, and is therefore more for the interest of mankind and peace of societies.* And certainly that which surrenders all hath no hazard to apprehend. But if the Christian world had been of your opinion, how had its religion long since been swallowed up of Turcisme? And if our fathers in the first dawnsings of reformation had not as-

ter a noble conflict of martyrdomes and persecutions discerned the times, and laid hold on the opportunitie, I am sure in all probabilitie Scotland had been to this day as France, and worse, and the United as the Spanish Netherlands, and all Germanie under one cloud. If you doe therefore judge Religion to be of the interest of mankind doe not deny it the libertie of a right nor deprive it of its just priviledge, seing on the one hand this is not more iniquous and in effect impossible, then on the other your pretendings to peace by such arguing doe visibly tend to the ruine of truth.

Having gone this far with my friend you desire him to look backe seriously upon these two different methods of advancing religion that he may see whether of them will preponderat. But Sir if I may prevaile with you in any thing, I earnestly obtest you to use more ingenuitie, did ever we assert or practise the advancing of religion by fighting? Or did we at any time in order to this end so much as lay suffering and fighting in one balance? Or lastly must I againe inculcat that all that we maintaine, is, that in case of violent persecution for religion the oppressed may lawfully assume their owne defence as upon the provocation of any other injurie whatsomever.

After this, dissembeling your knowledge of our aversion for war, not capable to be ingaged but by manifest extremitie, you please your self with some few speculations of the advantages of peace and disadvantages of war: but seing such little arts are sufficiently discussed by the simple noticing, let us hear how you make it out by Scripture instance *that fighting is not a methode approved of God for advancing his cause*, And for eschewing cavill, I am here willing to think *that by advancing of his cause* you onely mean the preservation of religion and its professors against their

their persecutors, and your first instance is of the *Israelites who while in Egypt long oppressed in their religion and libertie though very numerous and in a probable capacite yet made no attempt by force for their owne deliverie.* But pray Sir doe you think the Israelites in their bondage could have foughten with weapons when they wer denyed straw? Or doth not such headles quibbling as manifestly conclude that becaus of their constrained subjection under their severall oppressors the time of the judges, therefore their after vindications of their liberty were sinful, but the truth is seing that if God so ordered the matter in his providence as the Israelites neither did nor could endeavour their owne libertie, that he might in his owne way manifest his glory, your inference that therefore either they might not have done it lawfully, or that we are obliged to imitat their forced and simple omissions is not worth the noticing, and really this reasoning is so weake and pitiful that I am almost ashamed to have repeated it.

The next instance which you promise *shall be yet stronger* (as truely it had need) is taken from the ten tribes non resistance to Jeroboams defection, but knowing that they willingly walked after the commandment, and that if they had had the smallest measure of that zeal for religion which they testified for their owne liberty, they had not so tamely complied in that bakesliding, you recurre to the silence of the Prophets telling us that *if popular reformation had been the peoples duetie certainly they had exhorted to it.* Well Sir, is this your stronger reasoning? The Prophets by all the pains and industrie they did use could not awake this Stubborne people to repentance, and yet becaus forsooth they did not expressely excit them *active* to reforme, who were in effect to have been its only objects, from this you conclude that the thing was not their duetie.

But you adde that though Ahab added the idolatrie of Baal to the sin of the Calves, yet Eliah never stirred up the people to armes, is not this solid arguing? The people of Israel had at this time so deeply revolted that when the Prophet put it home to them, if the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal then follow him, they answered not a word, yea afterward when he was forced to flee from Jezabels rage he thought he had been the only seeker of the true God left in Israel, & yet without any regard to a most manifest unlikelihood you think because the Prophet did not preposterously call them to it, that therefore (not withstanding all that my friend hath said for it) national reformation was not their part, the absurditie of which argument is so much the more grosse, that even in the same Prophet and people after a due preparation you may finde your assertion contradicted, inasmuch as immediatlie upon the backe of their acknowledgement of the Lord to be God Eliah *said unto them* (the King being present) *take the Prophets of Baal, let none of them escape, &c.* a verie probable intimation that not onely they might have done it, though the King had countermanded, but that even without Eliah's exhortation it had been nothing beside their duetie.

From Israel you passe to Judah and finding there the like defections you repeat to us the same observes, but seeing that all the Prophets doe testifie aloud of the universall bakeslidings of that people together with their Kings, and Isaiah and Jeremiah doe expressly and frequentlie complaine that none did call for justice, or plead for truth, &c. And that they were not valiant for the truth, as it is evident that they are thereby *charged with lukewarmnesse in the cause of God*, so it seemes that for the generality they were no lesse perverse in heart then their ringleaders in these defections

sections, as these very persecutions perhaps of faithful dissenters under Manasse whom you vainly represent *as ignorant of our politicks* may very plainly evince? And as for that of *Libnah* seeing the Scripture expressly saith, that they did revolt from under the hand of the King (and not from under Judah as the Edomites did) *Because he had forsaken the Lord God of his Fathers*; your questioning its approbation, because of the not ensuing of the like practise, is both presumptuous against Scripture evidence, and derogatorie from the praise of all more noble and rare exploits.

Having proposed your instances as we have heard, you seal them with a grave *truly you must confesse these instances to be strong*, and really since you deale so obligingly with my friend as not to force him by any reason, I beleave if the thing were a matter of complement he would in civility cede it, but seeing it is truth we contend for, without further canvassing of what you subjoine *of the nature of Moses dispensation or the Gospels call to the Crosse*, I frankly leave it as you do *with all free mindes to consider* whether your poor blinde negatives be of any moment to preponderat that cleare light of reason which shineth in our assertions, and is confirmed both by old testament examples and new testament approbations, as my friend & the answerer of the dialogues do evidently hold out.

As to your ensuing section *anent the first ages of the Church their unacquaintednesse with this doctrine and your boasting Historical observe, that until Pope Gregory the 7th his dayes it was unheard of in the Church, with your endeavours to render it odious by the patrociny of Cannonists and Jesuits* it is so exactly the same with the discourse of the dialogues, and is by the answerer so clearly discussed, that I am not affraid to oppose his single reply to your vaine repetitions; one thing I must tell you, that seeing you cannot deny that about and after

Constantines dayes when Christians arrived to a greater consistency and better capacity not only did Constantine himself with the expresse approbation & assisting presence of the Godliest teachers in these times fight against Licinius for his persecutions, but also both the oppressed Christians in the east did assert by armes the liberty of the Gospel against Jovius, Maximinus and at other times and in other places they implored the aid of Christian and orthodox Emperours against pagan and Arrian persecuters, your endeavour to put a tashe upon *these practises as criminal* which yet all the after ages of the Church have approved, and to evade by saying *that the doctrine was not then owned* which was onely not expressely maintained, because not contradicted, is nothing at all ingenuous; & therefore since it is certaine that even the most excellent truths have been lyable to the foulest abuses, neither your odious dating of the doctrine of resistance from a notorious Papall rebellion, nor your futilous essay to make men beleve that its onely propagators were the Popes Parasits do deserve any further notice.

And now we are come to the close of your Letter, wherein conceiting that *either you have made sure our conviction*, or discovered *our cure to be with men impossible* you think good to give a testimony to your self, which I am perswaded, considering the folly or falsehood of the poor purpose that I have perused, among all that have written on the subject you deserve least. But if you misse of your owne praise, you are resolved my friend shall fare no better, and therefore, as if this were the first of it, you pretend constraint for *one severe word* to tell him; whom almost in the beginning you termed *an agent of hell, as evill as Beelzebub*, that you do feare him *to be in the gall of bitterness*, Sir, although such reproaches be to me very light, yet I wish that for your own soules good
you

you would seriously ponder that to undervalue the grace, and despise the glory of the work and cause of God that we have seen in the land, to strengthen the wicked in their wickednesse, & adde affliction to these whom for conscience onely men do persecute, are characters of this wretched and woful state, equal (if not worse) to what appeared in him against whom these words were first pronounced, whether your preceeding discourse and subsequent stricture in this place against the cause of God do partake of these evils I leave it with your selfe.

Your last observe is upon my friends postscript, occasioned by the Bishop of *St Andrews* his affirming in a sermon *that the subjects lives were more the Kings then their own*, and his passage so moves your spleen, that it is evident you resolve to be behinde with him in nothing, and therefore after you have characterized him *as insolent, guilty of rebellion, and treason*, all the difference betwixt you and him is that what the postscript would have done by *St Andrewes* upon himself in a just consonancy to and punishment of his lying flattery, you would have the King for no cause to inflict on my friend as real demerit. But that which I concerne myself most to notice, is the medium that you use to convince us of the truth of the Bishops position, *viz. that because a subject committing a capital crime hath no right to be the executioner of justice on himself, therefore his life is more in the Kings power then in his own* but not to differ with you about thir pitieful words which were that *all mens lives are in the Kings hand and hold of him*, what ever agreement or place the argument may haue as to the Bishop, and amongst his complices, persons its like conscious of their own guilt, yet sure I am as all honest men are without the compasse of such a title, so he must be a fool as well as a knave that will hold a plaine forfeiture to the King

to be a good tenor of him; the Bishop no doubt thought he had passed a great complement upon his Majesty when by putting his life in the Kings power he gave more unto him then he hath himself, but when you come to be his interpreter how strangely do you misserve them both? *the Bishop* by supposing him to be criminal, and so making him by right to amitt what he thought he had freely given, *and the King*, by presenting him with nothing else then the forfeited lives of wretched catives in place of the loyal resignation of free leiges; but leaving these your follies which if they had escaped my friend had no doubt been lashed by you as *dull buffonries* and the *coarsest of vallerie without either edge or point*, the truth is our lives are not our own; *all soules are mine saith the Lord*, and therefore as we neither can give them up absolutely unto the Prince his arbitrary disposal, nor hath the Lord even in the case of the most atrocious crime obliged the criminal to be *felo de se* and his own executioner, so all the power the Magistrat can pretend is onely founded in the sentence of righteous Law, by which the person guiltie, losing his right, is therefore both by the will of God, and his owne consent subjected *to the Magistrats* execution and how much this doth militat both against the Bishops flatterie and the pretensions of tyrannie all sober men may preceive.

[Thus Sir in place of your examining my friends book in *bulk*, evident enough by the *grossnesse* of your reflexions, I have considered your Letter by *retaille*, wherein I am assured you will see that I have omitted to answer nothing except such things as silence will best reprove, What satisfaction you will finde in my reply dependeth upon your self: only in this I think I merit your acknowledgement that by my prevention I have delivered you out of my friends hands, who probably would have searched you out in a more accurate manner, if my sincere endeavours shall produce to you any greater advantage, it is according to the serious desire of one who though he hath no reason to be more, yet subscribeth himself,

SIR,
Your real well-wisher.

Pag. 6. lin. 3. read sufferings. Pag. 9. l. 3. r. enough, p. 10.
l. 1. r. doing. p. 17. l. 12. r. Skeens. p. 25. l. 1. r. this.

F I N I S.

